

he himself should be forgiven, that at times he cannot control himself, so that, if he has offended, his madness must be blamed. It might be all right to deceive two whom he knew to be spies, but one would not think that an honorable man like Hamlet, in an affair of honor, would give temporary madness as an excuse, if his madness was feigned.

Joe—He may have meant by madness some defect in his character which made him sometimes irresolute and sometimes impulsive.

Dick—Surely his conduct at the grave of Ophelia is a sign of madness. No person in his senses would have acted or talked as he did on that occasion.

Joe—On that occasion he was carried outside of himself by seeing Laertes weeping and mourning for Ophelia, as if he was the only one that had loved her. His anger caused him to act rashly. But now I will quote a few instances and show how sane Hamlet was. In all his soliloquies, although he often accuses himself of forgetfulness and irresolution, he never gives any signs of an unbalanced mind. In his conversations with Horatio he is always sensible. The plan by which he makes sure of the king's guilt is admirable and is certainly not the product of a weak mind. The way he sent Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to death was surely the result of a strong intellect. What he says in his conversations with Polonius is rambling, but it is sharp and sarcastic and certainly not foolish, and indeed in these and in his meeting with Osric, he shows great keenness and wit.

Dick—Well, of course his reason was not completely gone by any means, but I cannot help thinking that, on some occasions, his madness was too realistic to be feigned. However, we cannot hope to solve the question about which so many better men have differed, so the best thing we can do is to agree to disagree, and so drop the subject altogether.

V. MEAGHER, '04.